



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IN VACATION.

ABUSIVE AND OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE.—Mere grimaces or contemptuous facial expressions cannot amount to abusive language. *Behling v. State*, 110 Ga. 754, 36 S. E. Rep. 85, per Lewis, J.

DAMN NOT CURSING.—A charge of "cursing" is not proven by evidence that the accused said "damn" or something to that effect. *Carr v. Conyers*, 84 Ga. 287, 10 S. E. Rep. 630, 20 Amer. St. Rep. 357.

AMERICANS LITIGIOUS.—"The law makers and the law expounders have finally and recently perceived that the people of this country are the most litigious in the world. That is perhaps a natural result among the people whose efforts are to live by their wits, rather than by toil." *Hughes v. Green*, 75 Fed. Rep. 691, per Hallett, J.

MUTUAL RIGHTS OF MULE AND LOCOMOTIVE.—"A locomotive and a mule may well pass over the same ground, so that they pass at different moments of time." *Georgia R., etc., Co. v. Neely*, 56 Ga. 540, per Bleckley, J.

ZOOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE UNNECESSARY.—When minks are pursuing geese, the owner of the geese need not, before killing the minks, postpone and neglect his usual occupations, and examine zoological authorities on the question whether his geese are endangered in life or limb by the minks. *Aldrich v. Wright*, 53 N. H. 398, per Doe, J.

DOGS.—"A person is not bound to stand quietly and be bitten by a dog, nor to give him what might be called a fair fight among men." *Perry v. Phipps*, 10 Ired. L. (32 N. Car.) 259, 51 Am. Dec. 386, per Ruffin, C. J.

A DOG LOVING JUDGE.—"When we call to mind the small spaniel that saved the life of William of Orange and thus probably changed the current of modern history, and the faithful St. Bernard, which, after a storm has swept over the crests and sides of the Alps, start out in search of lost travelers, the claim that the nature of a dog is essentially base, and that he should be left a prey to every vagabond who chooses to steal him, will not now receive ready assent." *Mullahy v. People*, 86 N. Y. 365, per Earl, J.

DRAWS THE LINE AT THE GOOSE.—An opinion of Wilkes, J., of the Tennessee Supreme Court, holds that a goose is not an “animal or obstruction” for which the statute requires a train to signal or stop when an animal or obstruction is before it on the track. The opinion says: “It is true a goose has animal life, and in the broadest sense is an animal; but we think the statute does not require the stopping of trains to prevent running over birds, such as geese, ducks, chickens, pigeons, canaries, or other birds that may be kept for pleasure or profit. . . . The line must be drawn somewhere, and we are of the opinion that the goose is a proper bird to draw it at.”

READING THE LAW TO THE JURY.—In a jury trial at Toronto recently the solicitor for the defendant started in to read to the jury from a certain volume of the Supreme Court reports. He was interrupted by the court, who said: “Mr. —, it is not admissible, you know, to read law to the jury.” “Yes, I understand, your Lordship; I am only reading to the jury decision of the Supreme Court.”